

This record is a partial extract of the original cable. The full text of the original cable is not available.

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 01 OF 02 BRUSSELS 002730

SIPDIS

NOFORN

E.O. 12958: DECL: 07/18/2015

TAGS: [PREL](#) [MOPS](#) [SU](#) [EUN](#) [USEU](#) [BRUSSELS](#)

SUBJECT: EC CONSIDERS FUNDING OPTIONS FOR AMIS

Classified By: PRMOFF MARC J. MEZNAR. REASONS 1.4 (B) AND (D).

1. (C) Summary. Although the European Commission (EC) has reservations about expanding the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS IIe) beyond 7000 peacekeepers, it nonetheless is considering a third funding tranche from its Africa Peace Facility (APF). Even if the EC uses most of the APF balance, funding would only extend AMIS IIe through April 2006. The EC hopes that other donors, like the U.S., will also provide additional significant contributions in order to extend the expanded operation for at least a year beyond October 2005. While the Commission's main objective in contributing to AMIS is strengthening the AU's future capacity, the European Council's focus is on reducing violence in Darfur and in raising the profile of the EU internationally. End Summary.

AMIS II Expansion (AMIS IIe)

2. (U) The original sum allocated from the APF to support the Darfur mission was 80 million euros. Two tranches have so far been released by the EC to the AU, each of 23.1 million euros, leaving a balance of 33.8 million euros. (Note. The EC releases the tranches when the AU shows good budget figures of having spent 70% of the previous tranche so as to maintain the AU's cash flow. End Note.)

3. (U) The EC calculates that its current funding lines are sufficient to cover requirements up to October 20, 2005, as AU expenditures on allowances have been less due to delays in deploying additional personnel.

4. (C) While fully supporting an expanded AMIS of up to 7000 peacekeepers, the EC is lukewarm towards a larger operation. First, the EC is concerned that the AU does not have the institutional capacity to manage a large expansion. The operation risks becoming an AU mission in name only, with the overall control being in the hands of outsiders (i.e., the EU, U.S. and NATO). According to DG DEV policy officer for the APF, Ranieri Sabatucci, this would defeat the fundamental purpose of the APF, which was established with development funds to strengthen the AU's institutional capacity. The medium-term goal of the 250 million euro APF funding line is to raise the profile of the AU; the long-term goal is to develop a genuine African-owned and operated mechanism for peace enforcement throughout the continent.

5. (C) Second, unless other donors step forward with significant contributions for AMIS IIe, the EC's funding simply does not exist for sustaining a larger operation. Sabatucci pointed out that even if the EC uses the rest of the APF on Darfur (more than doubling its contribution), funding will run out by April 2006 because AMIS IIe will cost about 17 million euros per month to operate. Commission officials like Ranieri suggest that since the U.S. is most enthusiastic for expanding the number beyond 7000, it would seem logical the U.S. to provide the funding for the expanded AMIS mission. Before allocating and dispersing APF funds, the EC needs assurances from the AU that there is financial support for the entire proposed budget (preferably for a full year of operations). The EC will not do partial funding in hopes that other monies can be found later.

6. (C) One EC option for funding a third tranche is to reduce the number of elements in the AMIS budget (i.e., budget lines) which the EC funds. By narrowing the scope of its funds, the EC can guarantee that the part of the operation it commits to can be carried out for a full year (instead of ending in April 2006). It would be up to the AU to propose which budget lines would be cut.

Council versus Commission

7. (C) Two factors weigh in favor of a third EC tranche for AMIS. The AU reportedly supports this, as does the EU Council. The Council, while paying lip service to the EC's overall objective of strengthening AU institutions and capacity through the APF, is far more interested in the short-term goal of reducing violence in Darfur. This is one reason the Council has been more aggressive in urging the EC to condition its funding on the AU accepting technical and

logistical support. The EC agreed with this conditionality in order to ensure operational success of the mission, thus strengthening the AU politically.

18. (C/NF) However, the friction between the EC and Council remains over Darfur. The EC does not fully share the Council's political objective of raising the EU's profile by intervening in Darfur. Sabatucci (protect) explained that for this reason the EC resisted the Council's attempt to block NATO involvement in Darfur. Reportedly, the Council asked the EC to use its funding prerogative to dissuade the AU from requesting NATO assistance, but the EC declined to intervene.

19. (C) According to EuropeAid's APF technical expert Peter Stamps, the PSC will have to take up the question of a third tranche to support AMIS IIe no later than this week or risk interrupting the cash flow to the AU. His personal opinion is "we've all tacked our colors to the mast" in support of the AU so it would be politically impossible to back off now. Therefore, he anticipates PSC agreement to a 3rd cooperation agreement to establish funding for AMIS IIe after October 20, 2005. Reportedly, the EC would consider using the balance of the APF -- apart from 15 million euros for a possible AU mission in Somalia -- for this third tranche allocation.

Comment

10. (C) The competing interests in Darfur - both intra-EU and transatlantic - are not mutually exclusive. Increased involvement by the various players, together with their assets and funds, can help achieve multiple objectives, including: strengthening the AU as an institution, reducing violence in Darfur, raising the international profile of the EU, expanding NATO's role in Africa and improving peace enforcement capabilities. The EC is poised to commit additional funds for AMIS. Significant contributions by other donors could clinch the decision and help sustain an expanded operation. Meanwhile, the EC also continues to study the possibility of replenishing the APF as it approaches the end of its seven-year budget cycle.

MINIMIZE CONSIDERED

McKinley

.